basis for your perspective? (Ref. L8-2)
Section 916.9(b) has a connection to regular requirements in Section 916.4, including notably Section 916.4(a)(2-6). Are these two section duplicative, inconsistent, or unclear, or not providing adequate information for assessing impact? What is the legal, policy, or science
Should rules state that small contributions to pre -project cumulatively considerable adverse conditions be avoided, minimized or mitigated? What is the legal, policy, or science basis for your perspective?(ref L7-
Should the T/I rules or the FPRs in general develop a disturbance ind reflecting cumulative sediment effects and a watershed's resiliency to stressing storms? What is the legal, policy, or science basis for your perspective? (Ref L7-4).
Do the T/I rules or the FPRs in general provide adequate guidance and effective mitigation for addressing cumulative sediment effects as related to rate of harvest which is related to watershed resiliency to stressing storms? What is the legal, policy, or science basis for your perspective?(Ref L7-4, L15-7).
Do the T/I rules or the FPRs in general provide adequate guidance and effective mitigation for addressing cumulative sediment effects associated with roads? What is the legal, policy, or science basis for your perspective? (Ref L7-3).
Is there adequate guidance for cumulative impact assessment and effective cumulative impacts mitigation in the T/I rules or the FPRs in general.What is the legal, policy, or science basis for your perspective? (Ref. L7-1, L15-2))
To be responsive to the potential for cumulative effects, the spatial scale of applicability of the T/I rules must expand beyond a T/I watershed area to consider T/I rules in those "non-T/I" watersheds that flow into a "T/I" watershed. Should cumulative impacts analysis consider upstream areas of planning watersheds that are completely outside the anadromous zone? What is the legal, policy, or science basis for your perspective? (Ref: L14-2, L17-3)
(Group # 3 Cumulative Impacts, Section 898 and 916.9(b))

72	71	70	69	68	Key question number
898	(a)6.9(b)	(p)6.9(e)	916.9(b)	916.9(b)	FPR Rule Sec.
Cumulative Impacts	Cumulative Impacts	Cumulative Impacts	Cumulative Impacts	Cumulative Impacts	FPR Title or general subject
Consistency with other agency policies and laws	Science Basis; Consistency with other agency policies and laws	Consistency with other agency policies and laws	Consistency with other agency policies and laws	Consistency with other agency policies and laws	Review Issues
Where waters are 303(d)-listed, the FPRs currently require that a RPF assess the degree to which a proposed timber operation could impact any portion of a water body that is located within or downstream of the proposed timber operation, and propose appropriate mitigation measures (14 CCR 898). Should this same provision apply where fish are ESA-listed? (Ref: L16-5)	Is there adequate guidance for watershed- wide analysis in the T/I rules or the FPRs in general. (Ref. L15-11))	Should timber harvest proposed in non-T/I planning watersheds that drain to T/I watersheds explicitly assess the potential for cumulative impacts that could occur in downstream areas as a result of proposed timber operations? Do the existing T/I rules or other FPR sections adequately require this assessment? (Ref L14-2)	Code Section — 916.9 (b)[936.9(b), 956.9(b)] Because a plan located within a T&I watershed can likely be assumed to have adverse cumulative watershed effects on anadromous salmonid species, why should the plan acknowledge or refute such conditions? Should this section be removed in its entirety? Since timber operations cannot offset all impacts that adversely effect salmonids, should this section be modified to reflect the ability of the timber operation to reduce adverse effects? (Ref. L9-6)	Code Section – 916.9 (b)[936.9(b), 956.9(b)] Are there private information disclosure issues on part of plan preparing RPFs related to implementing this section? (Ref L9-6)	Key Questions
Agencies CAL FIRE	TAC Agencies CAL FIRE	Agencies CAL FIRE	Agencies CAL FIRE	CAL FIRE	Assigned Review Group